Editor
News-Post
Frederick, Md. 21701

1/13/89

I am not sure that I fully understand the letter of Louis Edward and Fatma Nuban Willhauck published January 13. They say they endorse the right to disagree, that they were motivated to write by some of my recent letters, that they respect what I have written as much as they do Roy Meachum's writing (which is contradicted by some of their rhetorical questions), and they seem to be saying that I have some kind of "secret agenda" and in this sense, that readers "must look beyond that which is said to the person or organization that is saying it."

When they ask "Do the Israelis have any more right to a homeland and self-determination than the Palestinians" they ignore what I have written, beginning with my saying that the situation in the holy land is complicated by many factors not the least of which is that two peoples can make legitimate claim to the same land.

Roy Meachum's agenda is not at all secret. He is entirely anti-Israel and anti-Semitic in his long series of biased and not infrequently inaccurate columns. My agenda is quite obviously not secret: I oppose what he has written on this matter. And, of course, I have opposed vigorously his proclaing that the Abu Nidal gang and other terrorists are not terrorists ~~and that they~~ but are an Islamic equivalent of our founding fathers.

Whether or not there is, in fact, a Palestinian homeland right now is something neither Roy Meachum nor the Willhauks address. Jordan is about 77 percent of the original Palestine territory Great Britain took from the Ottoman Empire after World War I. That the present state of existo ~~present Israel consists of the land of the State~~ of Israel and that it holds the Gaza ~~Gza~~ Strip and what to Jews is their ancient homeland, Judea and Samaria, is 100 percent attributable to the Islamic effort to see ~~determination~~ that there be no State of Israel. (I note again that the PLO has not changed its charter, which still calls for wiping the State of Israel out.)

If the Arabs had accepted the proposal of the British Peel Commission in 1937, as Jews did, the present state of Israel would consist of only 10 percent of the 30 percent of the territory of Palestine ~~not~~ not given the name "Trans-~~to~~ Jordan." Then and ever since Arabs have refused to discuss any of the many offers ~~kind~~ of settlement that permitted any State of Israel. Arafat's recent and much-touted statement, which

specifically is not an official statement of the PLO's executive , is careful not to recognize the right of the State of Israel to peace and security.

When it declared itself a state Israel accepted all Jews from the Muslim world. Arabs refused to accept Arab refugees who wanted to leave the State of Israel. They wanted their refugees to suffer, to be their "artillery" in their determination to end the State of Israel, as Paul Johnson sets forth in the last chapter of his book, "A History of the Jews." Johnson is a non-Jewish British historian. This last chapter has a full history of Arab refusal ever to discuss any settlement that recognized any State of Israel. It is available in a quality paperback. I recommend it to those who want an impartial source on the history and reasons for the present awful situation there and particularly to those who want to be able to make their own determination about who among us writes with accuracy and fairness about that situation and who does not.

For those who want a quick answer, it ought be obvious that if the Arabs had accepted the UN proposals of more than four decades ago, which Jews did, none of the pain and suffering since then would have ensued. It is the determined Arab non-secret agenda of ending the State of Israel that is the direct cause of all the pain, wounding and killing. and as of now, of the more than 20 Islamic states, only Sadat's Egypt recognized the State of Israel. Sadat was assassinated by other Arabs for it and the rest of the Islamic world is officially in a state of war with Israel.

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg